

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **19 May 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. The Claims in 1-21 are directed to non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph because current case law (and accordingly, the MPEP) require such a rejection if a 101 rejection is given because when Applicant has not in fact disclosed the practical application for the invention. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen (*Global Optimization Using Interval Analysis*, (hereinafter Hansen)).

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101, 35 U.S.C. §112, and 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-21 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, and as anticipated by Hansen.

Applicant has canceled claims 1-21 and added new claims 22-28 to clarify that the present invention is directed to a **computer system** for solving an interval global optimization problem, wherein a processor within the computer system includes a special-purpose arithmetic unit for performing interval arithmetic operations as illustrated in FIGs. 3-5. Note that unlike conventional arithmetic units which receive two inputs and produce a single output, this special-purpose arithmetic unit receives four inputs representing the endpoints of two interval operands and produces two outputs representing the two endpoints of a resulting interval.

A computer system is statutory subject matter for the invention, thus obviating the 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. Hansen fails to teach a specific hardware device for solving the interval global optimization problem as claimed in the instant application, thus obviating the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 22 is in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 23-28, which depend

upon claim 22, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 6 June 6, 2005

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1661  
FAX: (530) 759-1665